

last election cycle while fighting to protect Federal grazing fee policies that give ranchers access to Federal lands at below-market prices.

The mining industry spent over \$1 million in 1993-94 on campaign contributions to Members of Congress so that they could try to prevent the reform of the 1872 mining law which allows people to pay a few thousand dollars for land that contains billions of dollars worth of gold and silver and other minerals.

The oil and gas interests contributed over \$6.1 million during the last election cycle to help back their hefty 1995 agenda, which included repeal of the alternative minimum tax. They do not even want to pay a minimum tax for all the profits they are making.

Mr. President, in the 6 weeks following a close House vote on funding the B-2 bomber, opposed by even the Defense Department, contributions from defense contractor Northrop Grumman's PAC's to House Members who voted for the program totaled over \$50,000, just from that one company for that one program that the Defense Department did not even want.

Mr. President, obviously I could go on with these examples, but they show the fact it is not just a question of there being too much money in campaigns, but the connection between campaigns and the fact that we still have a terrible budget and deficit problem in this country.

So, Mr. President, it has become clear to many of us, Democrats and Republicans alike, that their failed campaign finance system contributes to keeping many unnecessary Government subsidies flowing, and it helps explain why well-financed special interests were able to grab the legislative process by the scruff of the neck in the first place.

Mr. President, it is my fond hope the President of the United States will use his bully pulpit and excellent intentions on this issue to give a strong push behind the bicameral, bipartisan effort to reform our campaign finance laws.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

Mr. HEFLIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

#### BUDGET NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I believe we are closer to a balanced budget than we have been in many years. I think the public overwhelmingly wants a balanced budget. I think we are moving in that direction. But there are little problems here and there that seem to prevent us from getting together in being able to shake hands on a balanced budget.

The President and the Republican leadership I think all realize that we need a balanced budget for it will certainly directly affect virtually every segment of the Government and every citizen of the country. I feel that lost

in the political rhetoric over the budget is the fact that we have reached substantial agreements at this stage.

We have agreed that the budget ought to be balanced in 7 years. We have agreed that CBO figures ought to be controlling. We have agreed that there ought to be less Government. We have agreed that there ought to be a tax cut. And while both sides still have some major differences to work out, I feel that good-faith negotiations on these issues can yield a budget that is fair and equitable to all segments of society, and each party can claim victory.

When the recess occurred, there was a statement to the effect that we were going to stop the negotiations and then come back again.

There have been three or four efforts that have been made recently to try to get the parties together to start negotiating again. But for some reason or other they have been called off. Now that the recess is over, and the recess from the negotiations is over, it is time to begin again and for each side to meet and come to an agreement. The longer the negotiators avoid constructive negotiations the greater the chances for each side to become reentrenched in their policy positions.

Compromise is an art that appears to have somehow been forgotten. It is apparent that in order for an agreement to be reached, both Democrats and Republicans are going to have to give and take. Each side is going to have to have some wins and each side is going to have to have some losses. If the Israelis and the Palestinians can get together and negotiate in good faith, there is no reason why the Democrats and the Republicans cannot do likewise. If the Croats, Moslems, and Serbs can agree on a cease-fire, why cannot both parties put their verbal pistols back in their holsters?

I do not know exactly what the solution is. But it may well be that we may have to go to Camp David and tell them to stay there until they reach an agreement. Maybe Dayton is the place. Maybe Norway. But whatever it takes in regards to getting together and finding a location and staying with it until we reach an agreement, it seems to me to be the proper course to follow. When you add it up, the current Democratic proposals and the Republican proposals are less than \$100 billion apart. Taking into account \$12 trillion over a 7-year period, this figure amounts to less than .8 of 1 percent. With this in mind, it seems to me that the negotiations should proceed with an emphasis on what each side is willing to give and take in order to reach a long overdue budget agreement.

The State of the Union Address will have a significant impact on the negotiations. It is a good opportunity for the President to demonstrate his willingness to reach an accord. However, if his speech is overly partisan, it can harm the negotiating atmosphere by having a hardening effect on the Republican negotiators. Likewise, the Re-

publican response can also either help or hurt the negotiating process.

Hopefully, the President will extend a hand of conciliation, and if he does, I hope the Republicans will not slap it, but instead shake it. I hope that each Senator will keep this in mind when determining exactly what he or she wants to convey, when commenting on the content of the President's speech. Each Senator must be aware that their responses may affect the overall negotiations pertaining to the budget.

We need to adopt a continuing resolution—hopefully a clean one—by January 26. The expiration of the current continuing resolution, of course, runs out on that date. Despite all the heated rhetoric, I do not believe it is in the best interest of our citizens to have the remaining portion of Government closed down. A great number of the various Agencies and Departments will stay open under the legislation that has already been adopted.

Taxpayers and Federal employees should not be punished, because Congress and the administration have not fulfilled their obligation to reach a budget.

Mr. President, as I have stated before, I think it is imperative that we reach an agreement on the budget, and I am optimistic that when reasonable people sit down together an agreement can be worked out.

It seems to me we have made a great deal of progress. We have agreed on some fundamentals: A 7-year period for a balanced budget; CBO figures; a tax cut; and a cut in Government. We just need to get together. Perhaps we need a mediator. But I hope that we will let reason prevail, and we will not let this opportunity pass to achieve a balanced budget.

Mr. GRAMS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KYL). The Senator from Minnesota.

#### FRESHMAN TOUR: PROMISES MADE, PROMISES KEPT

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, too often here in Washington, politicians come to town with a mission but end up coming down with a severe case of Beltway fever.

They get caught up in the unreal atmosphere of this place and eventually forget what it was that first propelled them into public service.

They shut themselves away in their Senate or House offices or even in the Oval Office.

They spend their time hobnobbing with their new-found Washington friends. And after awhile, they just lose touch with the folks who sent them here. They think they are doing "the people's business," but in truth, they are no longer speaking for the people at all.

The 11 Members of the Senate freshman class came to town with a mission, too, a mandate given to us by the voters.

We met often as a group last year to track our progress. And as 1995 came to